UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,936	09/22/2003	John Moberg	1001.1715101	1606
	7590 04/03/200 SEAGER & TUFTE, L	EXAMINER		
1221 NICOLLE		LALLI, MELISSA LYNN		
SUITE 800 MINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55403-2420		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3728	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/667,936	MOBERG, JOHN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MELISSA L. LALLI	3728	

	MELISSA L. LALLI	3728				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>25 March 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the co	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.			
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  IOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	2001100			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	TE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
5. $\overline{\square}$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			•			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,7-13,19-21 and 24-26</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>5,6,22 and 23</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	t before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Anneal will not	t he entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/Mickey Yu/	/Melissa L Lalli/					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3728	Examiner, Art Unit 3728					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's argument regarding the 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 7-13, and 26 by Roll is not persuasive. The examiner is not using two characterizations as described by applicant, rather the rejection in paragraph 3 of the final rejection briefly maps the claim language to the structures of Roll and the response to arguments in paragraph 6 of the final rejection describes in detail the examiner's position on the location of the IFM in Roll's device. The two descriptions are not contradictory as stated by applicant. The elongate shaft (113) is directly attached to the hub assembly (104); hence it can be said that the shaft is part of the hub assembly. The IFM is disposed about at least a part of a portion of the hub assembly since the elongate shaft is a part of the hub assembly. Therefore, Roll anticipates each and every element of the claim in as much as is defined.

Applicant's argument regarding the 103 rejection of claims 1-4,7-11,13,19-21, and 24-26 over McGlinch and Gadberry is not persuasive. The examiner overstated what was needed in suggesting the motivation of creating "an air tight seal when enclosing the elongate medical device" to substitute the IFM including a second material of Gadberry for the IFM of McGlinch. Essentially, the IFM including a second material of Gadberry is used to form a friction fit between two elements (cap 27 and tube 23); whether the fit is air tight or not is irrelevant. Additionally, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).